

Application No. 10/667,369  
Amendment dated March 16, 2006  
After Final Office Action of December 16, 2005

Docket No.: 3313-1036P

### REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 12, 18 and 19 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

#### Entry of Amendment

Applicants request that the present Amendment be entered and given full consideration, as no new issues are being presented. The minor amendments to claim 12 merely specify more completely that the two half sides are part of the same first side. This has already been included in the language since they are referred to as one half side and the other half side. However, this addition is made in order to emphasize this fact. Thus, no new issues are being presented.

New dependent claim 19 has been added, which also is not believed to raise any new issues which require further search or consideration. Claim 19 specifies that the outlet of the airflow is opposite the side for the inlet. Applicants submit that no new issues are being submitted in this claim either. Accordingly, entry of the Amendment and full consideration thereof is considered to be proper.

#### Rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims 12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Barsun et al., U.S. Publication 2004/0256085. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that the reference teaches a heat dissipating fin module 400 having a base 414 and two sets of vertical fins having arc surfaces parallel to each other and

Application No. 10/667,369  
Amendment dated March 16, 2006  
After Final Office Action of December 16, 2005

Docket No.: 3313-1036P

spaces between the fins to provide airflow. However, it is noted that the inlets for the two sets of fins are on sides which are perpendicular to each other and that the outlet for each set of fins is 90° from the inlet. Thus, two fans are required for the inlets and the outlet air travels in two perpendicular directions. This differs from the present invention, wherein the two sets of curved fins both have their inlet on one side and both have their outlet on the opposite side. This allows a single fan to be used with the inlet and the outlet from both sets of fins travels in roughly the same direction, so that it is easier to remove the hot air which results.

Claim 12 previously included a description of this arrangement by stating that the first fins are installed on one half side while the second fins are installed on the other half side of the base. Applicants have made this language more specific by stating that the first fins are on one half of a first side and the second fins are installed on the other half of the first side. Applicants submit that either version of the claim defines over the Barsun et al. reference because the two sets of fins are not on half sides of the base, but are instead on essentially full sides, where the full sides are perpendicular. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is allowable.

Claim 18 depends on claim 12 and, as such, is also considered to be allowable.

New claim 19 has been added to specify that the inlet side and the outlet sides are opposite each other. This is not seen in the reference, where the inlet and outlet for each set of fins are perpendicular to each other. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 19 is allowable as well.

Application No. 10/667,369  
Amendment dated March 16, 2006  
After Final Office Action of December 16, 2005

Docket No.: 3313-1036P

Conclusion


In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patent relied upon by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No.: 32,334 #43,368  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant